

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/043,772	Applicant(s) KALOGEROPULOS, SPIROS
	Examiner Chih-Ching Chow	Art Unit 2192

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chih-Ching Chow. (3) _____.

(2) Serge Hodgson. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: An agreement has been reached, the Attorney will amend the Specification about item 706 (FIG. 9), and Claims 1, 5, 9, 20, and 29. The attorney will fax the amendment to the Examiner (see attached amendment).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which Interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Garden West Office Plaza
Suite 220
1900 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Tel. 831-655-0880
Fax 831-655-0888

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, LLP

*After phone interview
procedural (2)*


FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

To: USPTO From: Serge Hodgson
Examiner Chih Ching Chow
Phone: 571-272-3693 Pages: 5 (including this page)
Fax: 571-273-3693 Date: May 20, 2005

Re: Applicant(s): Spiros Kalogeropoulos
Assignee: Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Title: Enhanced Parallelism in Trace Scheduling by Using Renaming
Serial No.: 10/043,772 Filed: January 9, 2002
Examiner: Chih Ching Chow Group Art Unit: 2122
Docket No.: P-7139

Enclosed herewith is:

- 1) Summary of Examiner interview (4 pages)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No 571-273-3693, on the date shown below.	
	May 20, 2005
Serge Hodgson	Date of Signature

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT NAMED ABOVE. THIS MESSAGE MAY BE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION, AND AS SUCH IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR AN AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS DOCUMENT IN ERROR AND THAT ANY REVIEW, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US BY MAIL. THANK YOU.

Appl. No. 10/043,772
Sum. of Ext. Int. dated May 20, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Spiros Kalogeropoulos
Assignee: Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Title: ENHANCED PARALLELISM IN TRACE SCHEDULING BY USING RENAMING
Serial No.: 10/043,772 Filed: January 9, 2002
Examiner: Chow, Chih Ching Group Art 2122
Docket No.: P-7139 Unit:
Monterey, CA
May 20, 2005

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for the Examiner interview between the Examiner, Chih Ching Chow, and the Attorney for Applicant, Serge J. Hodgson, on May 20, 2005. Agreement was reached that the following amendments, which shall be entered as an Examiner Amendment, place the application in a condition for allowance.

The paragraph extending from page 18, line 33 to page 19, line 2 will be replaced with the following rewritten paragraph:

The present join instruction is now join instruction 306, which is the last join instruction. As discussed above, join instruction 306 is associated with basic block 108. Move instructions 702, 704 and instruction 118 (shown as instruction

GUNNISON, HIRSH &
BODGREN, LLP.
Gardia West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-4200
Fax (831) 655-0828

Appl. No. 10/043,772
Sum. of Ext. Int. dated May 20, 2005

706 in FIG. 9) follow join instruction 306 and are moved to basic block 108 as shown in FIG. 9.

Claim 1 shall be amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A method for a compiler using a computer system comprising:

building a trace comprising instructions that are stored in said computer system;

building a trace block comprising said instructions; scheduling said instructions within said trace block disregarding data dependencies from any off trace basic blocks, wherein at least one of said instructions is moved during said scheduling; and

correcting errors due to said at least one of said instructions being moved.

Claim 5 shall be amended as follows:

5. (Amended) The method of Claim 4 wherein said correcting errors further comprises determining whether said instructions are mapped to the same join instructions of the said join instructions after said scheduling as the said instructions were mapped before said scheduling.

Claim 9 shall be amended as follows:

9. (Amended) A method for a compiler using a computer system comprising:

building a trace comprising a first basic block and a second basic block, said first basic block comprising a first instruction that is stored in said computer system, said second basic block comprising a second instruction that is stored in said computer system;

building a trace block comprising said first instruction and said second instruction;

CUNNINGHAM, MCKAY &
HODGSON, LLP.
Gardena West Office Plaza
1900 Gardena Road, Suite 270
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0200
Fax (831) 655-0201

Appl. No. 10/043,772
Sum. of Ext. Int. dated May 20, 2005

scheduling said first instruction and said second instruction within said trace block disregarding data dependencies from off trace basic blocks, wherein said second instruction is moved from said second basic block to said first basic block during said scheduling; and

correcting errors due to said second instruction being moved.

Claim 20 shall be amended as follows:

20. (Amended) The system of Claim 19 wherein said correcting errors further comprises determining whether said instructions are mapped to the same join instructions of the said join instructions after said scheduling as the said instructions were mapped before said scheduling.

Claim 29 shall be amended as follows:

29. (Amended) The computer program product of Claim 28 wherein said correcting errors further comprises determining whether said instructions are mapped to the same join instructions of the said join instructions after said scheduling as the said instructions were mapped before said scheduling.

CUNNINGHAM, MCNAUL &
HODGSON, LLP.
Linden Way Office Plaza
1700 Gardner Road, Suite 220
Montgomery, AL 36116
(334) 615-0800
(334) 615-0801


Appl. No. 10/043,772
Sum. of Ext. Int. dated May 20, 2005

REMARKS

If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above or any further action is required on the part of Applicant, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).


CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-3693, on May 20, 2005.


Serge J. Hodgson

May 20, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Serge J. Hodgson
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,017

CURRISON, MCKAV &
HODGSON, LLP.
Curran WGP Office Plaza
1700 Century Avenue, Suite 2200
Mountain View, CA 94031
(650) 555-1000
Fax (650) 555-0888